



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,122	04/09/2001	Gary M. Katz	PIP-69B-KATZ	5972
31518	7590	12/05/2008		
NEIFELD IP LAW, PC 4813-B EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22304				
EXAMINER				
RETTA, YEHDEGA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3622				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/05/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

general@neifeld.com

neifeld@neifeld.com

rhahl@neifeld.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/828,122

Applicant(s)

KATZ, GARY M.

Examiner

Yehdega Retta

Art Unit

3622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Decision on petition to withdraw the restriction requirement filed October 20, 2008. Based on the Decision the restriction is withdrawn. Claims 1-64 are now pending.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 27 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The test for a proper dependent claim is whether the dependent claim includes every limitation of the parent claim. The test is not whether the claims differ in scope. A proper dependent claim shall not conceivably be infringed by anything, which would not also infringe the basic claim. If independent claim recites a method of making a specified product, a claim to the product set forth in the independent claim would not be a proper dependent claim since it is conceivable that the product claim can be infringed without infringing the base method claim if the product can be made by a method other than that recited in the base method claim. Therefore, claim 27 is improper dependent claims.

Claims 60, 61, 63 and 64 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claims recite "wherein said first determination determines that said consumer has not purchased a product item from said first product category", or "a product item of said first product". However claims 59 and 62 already recite the limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-19, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-19, 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. 35 U.S.C 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof" (emphasis added). Based on Supreme Court precedent, a method/process claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) (see at least *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (see at least *Gottschalk v.*

Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method/process claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here the claims fails to meet the above requirements because the steps are neither tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) nor physically transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing, and the steps recited in the claims can be performed in the mind of the user or by the use of a pencil and paper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 59-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 59 recites “printing on a single sheet of paper a (1) first promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item from that one of said first product category and said first product that said first determination indicates that said consumer has not purchased in order to obtain a first reward and (2) a second promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item from that one of said second product category and said second product that said second determination indicates that said consumer has purchased in order to obtain a second reward”. The specification teaches as follows:

[0014] As used herein, the term "promotion" refers to any offer, advertisement, incentive, coupon, and/or commercial for promoting one or more goods and/or services.

[0015] As used herein, to "exercise" a promotion refers to any redemption, consumption, employment, application, availment, and/or wielding of a promotion.

[0016] As used herein, the "relevancy" of a promotion refers to the likelihood that a promotion will be exercised.

[0017] As used herein, to "pair" promotions refers to any association of two or more promotions including printing together, requiring exercise together, displaying together, and/or showing together. Contrary to some common usages of the word "pairing," the present invention is not limited to associating only two promotions. Thus, three or more promotions may be "paired."

[0066] In step 5300, the more relevant promotion selected in step 5200 is paired with the low relevance promotion that the promoter wishes to provide to the consumer. As described above, "pairing" can indicate printing both the more relevant promotion and the low relevance promotion on a same piece of paper at, e.g., a promotion output device 634. "Pairing" can also indicate, e.g., displaying the promotions together on a single display.

[0071] The use of a more relevant promotion directed to a product which the consumer purchase in high volume is particularly effective for pairing with a low relevance promotion since the consumer recognizes the more relevant promotion as directed to a product which the consumer needs in relatively high volume. As such, the consumer is more likely to examine and exercise the low relevance promotion paired thereto in step 5300.

The specification discloses that the pairing of the low relevant and more relevant increase the likelihood of the consumer exercise the low relevance promotion. Although the specification teaches that the pairing of promotion includes printing together or requiring exercise (redemption or consumption) together, however does not teach “printing on a single sheet of paper a (1) first promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item from that one of said first product category and said first product that said first determination indicates that said consumer has not purchased in order to obtain a first reward and (2) a second promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item from that one of said second product category and said second product that said second determination indicates that said consumer has purchased in order to obtain a second reward”.

Regarding claim 62 the specification also does not teach “printing on a single sheet of paper a single promotion requiring, in order for said consumer to obtain a reward, that said consumer purchase both (1) a product item from that one of said first product category and said first product that said first determination indicates that said consumer has not purchased and (2) a product item from that one of said second product category and said second product that said second determination indicates that said consumer has purchased.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 59-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 59 recites determining in said computer system a first determination from said historical purchase record for said consumer that said consumer *has not purchased a product item* from one of a first product category **and a first product** in said first product category; determining in said computer system a second determination from said historical purchase record for said consumer that said consumer *has purchased a product item* from one of a second product category **and a second product** in said second product category; and printing on a single sheet of paper a (1) first promotion for said consumer **to purchase a product item from that one of said first product category and said first product** that said first determination indicates that said consumer has not purchased in order to obtain a first reward **and** (2) a second promotion for said consumer to purchase **a product item from that one of said second product category and said second product** that said second determination indicates that said consumer has purchased in order to obtain a second reward.

It is unclear if the determination is for a "product item" and a "first product" from a first product category and a "product item" and "a second product" from a second category. In short it is unclear if the "product item" and first or second item are the same or not. It is also unclear if the promotion includes purchasing a product item from the product category, the first product that is determined that the customer has not purchased, a second product item and the second product that is determined that the customer has purchased the product, i.e. the single sheet of paper includes a promotion that requires the customer to purchase two different products (a

product item from a first category and the first determined product) to obtain a first promotion and to purchase another two different products (a product from the second category and the second determined product (product purchased)) to obtain a second reward. Since in the preamble it clear that the method is for increasing the likelihood that a consumer **either** will purchase a *product item from a category of products that the customer has not purchased* **or** a purchased a **product item of a particular product that the customer has not previously purchased**, it is unclear whether the customer has to purchase all the four products to obtain a first and second reward together.

Claim 62 recites similar limitation as claim 59; therefore the rejection of 59 stated above applies.

Claims 61 and 64 recite “wherein said first determination determines that said consumer has not purchased a product item of said first product”. Since applicant’s specification does not differentiate a product item from a product itself, it is unclear how a “product item” differs from a “product”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-3, 20, 21, 26-30, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aggarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,349,309.

Regarding claims 1, 20, 21 and 27 Aggarwal teaches receiving identification from a customer (transaction or purchases) determining a category purchase history of the consumer (col. 10 lines 65 to col. 11 lines 15); selecting promotion determined by more relevant based upon the identification information and purchase history; paring (two or more) the low relevance and second relevance promotion (a list of recommended items in order of frequency of purchase) (see col. 11 lines 29-46).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Aggarwal teaches purchase history including frequency of purchases in a product or a number of purchases in a product category (see col. 11 line 1-15).

Regarding claims 26 and 27, Aggarwal teaches receiving promotional information regarding one promotion paring promotions with low relevance promotions with other promotions providing the paired promotions to the customer. Aggarwal teaches providing promotional list sorted according to for example frequency of purchase reported to user in order of frequency of purchase, i.e., with lower frequency of purchase listed under the ones with higher frequency of purchase (see col. 11 lines 7-46).

Regarding claims 28, 29 Aggarwal teaches determining a purchase history of the consumer (col. 10 lines 65 to col. 11 lines 15); selecting a promotion determined to be more relevant based upon the purchase history; paring the low relevance and second relevance promotion; providing the paired promotion to customer; outputting the data (see col. 11 lines 29-46).

Regarding claims 30, 33, 34, Aggarwal teaches the steps are computer implemented (see col. 10 lines 24-54).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-19, 22-25, 27, 31, 32, 35-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,349,309, and further in view of Herz et al. (US 6571279).

Regarding claims 4, 5, 22 and 23, Aggarwal teaches receiving identification from a customer (transaction or purchases) determining a product usage history (col. 10 lines 65 to col. 11 lines 15); selecting promotion determined to be more relevant based upon the identification information and purchase history; paring the low relevance and second relevance promotion (see col. 11 lines 29-46). Aggarwal teaches information about a customer's purchase behavior including a list of items purchased, the price of the items, the frequency of purchase and other

information relating to an item for sale or describing the customer (see col. 11 lines 7-15).

Aggarwal does not explicitly teach determining a promotional usage denominator. Herz teaches retailer extract and model patterns of customer shopping behavior for designing optimal sales promotions. Herz teaches storing information about the number and types of item purchased at different dates and times, customers price sensitivities and coupon usage and determining promotions (different sales at different price for different customers) based on the coupon usage. Herz also teaches the history and relative effect of the coupons that have already been generated for the item for purchase being stored (see col. 22 lines 26-67 and col. 23 lines 1-9, 43-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aggarwal's purchase behavior data to include the coupon usage data of a customer in order to provide shoppers with coupons and promotions specifically tailored to their preferences, as taught by Herz (see col. 23 lines 52-64). One would be motivated to consider the usage of the items in the promotion list of Aggarwal as part of the frequency purchases in order to customize the offer as taught in Herz.

Regarding claims 6, Aggarwal does not teach promotional usage relates to a location of where promotions are exercised. Official notice is taken that old and well known to record the location of where coupons or discounts are redeemed or used as part of the transaction history or profile. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include such information in the Aggarwal's customer's transaction database. One would be motivated to use the information and identify each location of a chain store if more than one location is provided, to provide the promotional list of Aggarwal at specific location, if the consumer frequents that specific location.

Regarding claims 7-18, 24, 25 and 27, Aggarwal teaches receiving identification from a customer (transaction or purchases) determining a product usage history of the consumer (col. 10 lines 65 to col. 11 lines 15); selecting promotion determined to be more relevant based upon the identification information and purchase history; paring the low relevance and second relevance promotion (see col. 11 lines 29-46). Aggarwal teaches information about a customer's purchase behavior including a list of items purchased, the price of the items, the frequency of purchase and other information relating to an item for sale or describing the customer (see col. 11 lines 7-15). Aggarwal does not explicitly teach determining a demographic characteristic; comprises of pet owner or parenthood. Herz teaches storing purchase history including demographic characteristics (customers with school-age children or pet owners) and determining appropriate coupons, which are most appropriate for the shopper (see col. 23 lines 1-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aggarwal's transaction database to determine the demographic characteristics of shoppers since Aggarwal consider each item purchased. One would be motivated to consider the customer's demographic characteristics, in the promotion list of Aggarwal, as part of the frequency purchases for the purpose of determining which coupons or promotions are most appropriate to the shopper, as taught by Herz (see col. 23 line 60 to col. 24 line 14). Since Aggarwal stores transaction history of every item purchased, whether the promotion is for goods from the same or different promoter, whether the product is new to the store or customer would not make a difference to Aggarwal's promotional list. Those limitations are non-functional descriptive material. However, Herz teaches recording information about product's size, shape, packaging and advertisement or anything that might impact its appeal to customers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to include such information in order to provide shopper with coupons or promotions specifically tailored to their preference as taught by Herz (see col. 23 lines 1-67 and col. 24 lines 9-51).

Regarding claim 19, Aggarwal teaches providing a promotional list with more than two items (see col. 11 lines 29-53).

Regarding claims 31, 32, Aggarwal teaches the steps are computer implemented (see col. 10 lines 24-54).

Regarding claims 35-58, Aggarwal teaches reporting to the customer the promotional list, but failed to explicitly indicate displaying or exercising the promotion. Herz teaches displaying promotional message and printing the coupons for customers who can use them for the day's shopping trip. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display Aggarwal's promotional list that is reported to customer and to allow user to exercise the coupon in order to motivate the customer to buy the product being promoted (see col. 24 lines 5-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 59-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Deaton et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,644,723.

Regarding claims 59-61, Deaton teaches providing a historical purchase record for a customer; determining from the historical purchase that the customer has not purchased a product (not purchased coffee or specific brand or coffee); determining from the historical purchase record that the consumer has purchased a product item from one of second category (see (different brand of coffee or purchasing products other than the brand or coffee)) (“printing on a single sheet of paper a (printing coupon at a point-of-sale (1) first promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item (any transaction at the point-of sale) from that one of said first product category and said first product that said first determination indicates that said consumer has not purchased (c.g. coupon to shop at delicatessen or coupon for coffee or specific brand of coffee) in order to obtain a first reward (coupon (discount) for the purchase of item not been purchased and (2) a second promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item from that one of said second product category and said second product that said second determination indicates that said consumer has purchased in order to obtain a second reward” (more than one coupon is printed at the point-of-sale, which indicated that more than one reward (discount) is provided during a shopping (spooling selected coupon at the point of sale) (see col. 69 line 42 to col. 71 line 18).

Regarding claims 62-64, Deaton teaches providing a historical purchase record for a customer; determining from the historical purchase that the customer has not purchased a product (not purchased coffee or specific brand or coffee); determining from the historical purchase record that the consumer has purchased a product item from one of second category (different brand of coffee or purchasing products other than the brand or coffee); printing on a single sheet of paper a single promotion requiring, in order for said consumer to obtain a reward

(printing coupon at a point-of-sale) said consumer purchase both (1) first promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item (any transaction at the point-of sale) from that one of said first product category and said first product that said first determination indicates that said consumer has not purchased (e.g. coupon to shop at delicatessen or coupon for coffee or specific brand of coffee) and (2) a second promotion for said consumer to purchase a product item from that one of said second product category and said second product that said second determination indicates that said consumer has purchased (see col. 69 line 42 to col. 71 line 18).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to the objection based on improper dependent, applicant argues that because the product of the claim 27 could be infringed without the performing any method step such as the steps defined by claim 1. It is for the same reason that the claim is improper. A proper dependent claim shall not conceivably be infringed by anything, which would not also infringe the basic claim. Therefore, the objection is proper.

Regarding the art rejection (under 102(e)), applicant argues that Aggarwal teaches away from providing information on “Low Relevance” products and does not disclose utilizing exercising promotions. Applicant argues that Aggarwal teaches limiting product information provided to consumer to products the consumer is likely to buy.

Applicant's disclosure discloses that the relevance of a promotion is determined based upon:

The number of time a product is purchased;

The number of times a product category is purchased;

The loyalty of a consumer to a brand;

The volume of consumer purchase;

Frequency of consumer purchases;

The value of the promotion;

Location where the promotion can be exercised;

Product who has never or only rarely purchased;

New product;

Product new to a location;

And in combination of one or more of any of the attributes described above.

According to applicant's disclosure, the consumer purchase history is referred for products previously purchased, the frequency of certain purchases, the name of the brands, price of the products, class or location of the products etc. in order to determine the relevance of a promotion and/or to identify a more relevant promotion for a product. The specification also discloses the purchase history of the consumer being examined to determine the number of purchases that the consumer has made of the promoter's products in each particular product line. The various product categories can then be ranked based upon a frequency (number) of purchases in each promoter product line and an arbitrary cut-off can then be used to classify each of the promoter product lines as "more relevant" or "low relevance".

The prior art, Aggarwal also teaches the customer's purchase (transaction) history being analyzed for the purpose of providing product recommendation to customers concerning, for example, items for sale (see col. 10 lines 32-38). Aggarwal further teaches providing a

promotion list, a list of items used to restrict the number of products which may be recommended to a target customer, for example to promote a sale of specific products (lines 55-63). Aggarwal teaches a data value corresponding to a transaction may include information on items for sale, quantities of items for sale, number of items purchased belonging to various product category, or frequency of purchases of items for sale (see col. 11 lines 1-15). The promotion list, for example, a list of preferred items provided by a manufacturer or distributor of items for sale, being reported to a user as recommended items, with the promotion list reported to user in order of frequency of purchase.

Therefore, the definition of the “low relevance” is not limited to a new product and/or product class or to product never purchased by the consumer, as argued by Applicant. As broadly interpreted and in light of the specification, the claim, as recited, includes the relevance of a promotion being determined based on frequency of consumer purchases and such limitation is disclosed in Aggarwal. Applicant’s definition of “pair” is association of two or more promotions. It is stated in the specification that the word pairing is not limited to associating only two promotions, thus three or more promotions may be paired (promotion list).

Applicant also argues that the “promotional list” of Aggarwal is not a promotion as defined in this application. Examiner disagrees. According to applicant’s specification promotion refers to any offer, advertisement, incentive, coupon and/or commercial for promoting one or more goods and/or services (see page 4). And Aggarwal definition of a “promotion list” is a list of items used to restrict the number of products which may be recommended to a target customer, for example to promote a sale of specific products (lines col. 10 lines 55-63), which means the same as applicant’s use of the term.

In regard to Applicant's argument that the Aggarwal promotion list is not exercisable as claimed. The independent claims do not recite exercising the promotion. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "exercisable" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Applicant's specification teaches determining the relevance of a promotions and pairing promotions together to determine that the likelihood that the promotions would be exercised. The specification itself teaches the intended purpose of the pairing of the promotion, printing or displaying the paired promotion, however **does not teach the promotion being exercised**.

In regard to Applicant's argument that there is insufficient motivation to combine Herz and Aggarwal teaching, the Examiner disagrees. According to applicant's disclosure the determination of the relevance of a promotion is made, by examining the promotion usage history of the customer. Further the specification discloses, the "promotion usage denominator" that relates to, e.g., the products for which promotions are exercised, the value of promotions that are exercised and/ or location where the promotions are exercised can be used to determine the relevance of a promotion to the consumer. The specification further discloses for example, if a consumer rarely exercises promotions that are worth less than 10%, than such promotions can be classified as of low relevance to the consumer.

Examiner agrees that Aggarwal does not teach promotion usage history, it is taught in Herz. Aggarwal teaches determining a promotion based on purchase history however does not explicitly teach determining a promotion based on the promotional history, e.g., based on promotions that are exercised or used or the relevance of the promotion. Herz however teaches database tracking the customer's price sensitivity and promotion usage history (coupon usage). Information stored for each purchase item being the history and relative effect of the coupons that have already been generated for it and developing a highly detailed database that connects shoppers to purchase items, price and coupons and analyzing the information and creating accurate models of customer behavior (see col. 23 lines 1-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Herz's coupon or promotional usage in Aggarwal promotional list. One would be motivated to track the usage of products in Aggarwal's promotional list in order to further tailor the promotion (promotional list) according the customer preferences (as indicated by their purchase histories) which include the use of the promotional list, as taught by Herz (see col. 23 lines 53-67).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yehdega Retta whose telephone number is (571) 272-6723. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

YR

/Yehdega Retta/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622